



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,598	06/12/2000	Richard Humpleman	SAM1.0065	7055

7590 06/03/2003

Kenneth L. Sherman
Sherman & Sherman
Seventeenth Floor
2029 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/592,598

Applicant(s)

HUMPLEMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment A, filed 3/10/2003.
2. Claims 1-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14 and 27 are independent claims.

In the Amendment A, claims 1, 14, and 27 are amended. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 6-15, 19-28 and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lea et al ("Lea", US #6032202).

As per independent claim 1. Lea teaches a method for providing a user interface for controlling devices that are currently connected to a network, the method comprising the steps of, for one or more of said devices:

obtaining information from devices currently connected to the network, said information including device information (col. 3, lines 5-12);

generating a user interface description in each of said one or more devices based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description in each device including one or more references associated with the device information of one or more devices currently connected to

Art Unit: 2174

the network, such that each reference includes at least one link to information contained in an associated device currently connected to the network (col. 2, lines 57-67); and

displaying user interfaces each based on one of said user interface descriptions, on devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface, for user control of said devices that are currently connected to the network (col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the step of displaying each user interface further includes the steps of:

using each reference in the corresponding user interface description to access the associated information in each device; generating the user interface including device data corresponding to each device using the accessed information in each device; and displaying the user interface on said device capable of displaying a user interface (col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19 and col. 17, lines 18-27).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches further comprising the steps of:

connecting at least one client device to the network capable of displaying a user interface; and displaying a user interface on the client device using the references in a user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network (col. 24, lines 60-67 through col. 25, lines 11-22; in this example, television is the client device).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches said at least one device is capable of displaying a user interface, and further comprising the steps of: displaying a user interface on said at least one device using the references in the user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network (col. 24, lines 60-67 through col. 25, lines 11-22).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description such that the reference in that user interface description provides access to at least the information in each corresponding device (col. 17, lines 18-27).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, wherein the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description such that the user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device (col. 9, lines 54-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the device information in each device includes device identification information (col. 7, lines 20-27).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the device information in each device includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device (col. 6, lines 40-48 and col. 10, lines 7-13).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description such that each reference in that user interface description is to at least the user control interface description in each corresponding device (col. 2, lines 57-67 through col. 3, lines 1-4, and col. 6, lines 40-48).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description wherein that user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device, the device data providing reference to the user control interface description in each device (col. 6, lines 58-67 through col. 7, lines 1-9).

As per independent claim 14, Lea teaches a network system for performing a service, comprising:

a physical layer, wherein the physical layer provides a communication medium that can be used by devices to communicate with each other (col. 7, lines 62-67; *IEEE 1394 serial communication bus*);

Art Unit: 2174

one or more devices connected to the physical layer (col. 7, lines 62-67), each device storing information including device information (col. 6, lines 40-48);

an agent in each of one or more devices, adapted for:

obtaining information from devices currently connected to the network, said information including device information (col. 3, lines 5-12);

generating a user interface description in each of said one or more devices based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description in each device including one or more references associated with the device information of one or more devices currently connected to the network, such that each reference includes at least one link to information contained in an associated device currently connected to the network (col. 2, lines 57-67); and

displaying user interfaces each based on one of said user interface descriptions, on devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface, for user control of said devices that are currently connected to the network (col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-19).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 11; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, it is a similar scope to claim 12; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 24, it is a similar scope to claim 13; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 14; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 15; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 19; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 20; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 21; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 22; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 23; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 24; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, it is a similar scope to claim 25; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, it is a similar scope to claim 26; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-5, 16-18 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lea in view of Venkatraman et al ("Venkatraman", US #5956487).

As per claims 3, 4 and 5, which are all dependent on claim 1, Lea does not disclose the step of generating a user interface description further comprises the steps of: associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network, the information in each device comprises an HTML page contained in that device, and

Art Unit: 2174

the step of displaying the user interface further comprises the steps of displaying the user interface on a browser on said device capable of displaying a user interface. Venkatraman discloses that in fig. 1A, fig. 2, and col. 3, lines 5-61, col. 5, lines 29-64. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Venkatraman of associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network, the information in each device comprises an HTML page contained in that device, and the step of displaying the user interface further comprises the steps of displaying the user interface on a browser on said device capable of displaying a user interface in Lea's method since HTML pages and the browser would allow the devices to interface with Internet, from service providers, via HTTP protocol

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 16; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 17; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 18; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3/11/2003 with respect to claims 1-28 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

(a) As per claim 1, despite the Patent Office's assumption, Lea does not disclose the steps of generating a user interface for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network, by obtaining information from one or more of the devices currently connected to the network, as required by claim 1. Lea mentions a mechanism whereby devices can be communicated with and controlled at some basic minimal level. Indeed, there is no mention of generating a user interface for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network, as claimed herein.

(b) In col. 2, lines 57-67, Lea only mentions that newly coupled devices are queried, and using the results of the query, a software based abstraction of that device is generated (i.e., device control module or DCM) and made available to other elements in the network. The DCM provides a predefined, standardized, set of interoperability, functionality, and control interfaces for the device. Therefore, Lea does not disclose a user interface description as claimed herein.

(c) Even if Lea can be somehow construed to provide a user interface description, Lea does not disclose that such a user interface description includes "one or more references associated with the device information of one or more devices currently connected to the network", as required by Claim 1. Nor does Lea disclose that "each reference includes at least

Art Unit: 2174

one link to information contained in an associated device currently connected to the network", as required by Claim 1. Lea does not teach the concept of using links in the user interface description, wherein the links provide access to information stored in devices connected to the network.

(d) Not only does Lea not disclose a user interface description as claimed, but Lea does not disclose "displaying user interfaces", "each based on one of said user interface descriptions", "on devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface", "for user control of said devices that are currently connected to the network", as required by Claim 1. Indeed, in the above passage, Lea clearly states that its system "... enables a control device (the FAV node) to present a general control user interface for all devices in the home network" By contrast, according to Claim 1 herein, user interface descriptions are generated independently by several network devices such as network devices capable of displaying user interfaces. Then different user interfaces are displayed on different network devices based on different user interface descriptions. Generating a user interface in each such device rather than generating a central user interface, allows each such device to show its own device icon/text preferentially in its user interface. As such, Lea does not teach any of said limitations in Claim 1.

(f) As per claim 2, Lea does not teach generating a user interface description, nor generating a user interface description including one or more references associated with the device information of one or more devices currently connected to the network. Further, Lea does not disclose placing references such as links to device information, in such user interface description. And, neither in the above passage nor elsewhere, does Lea disclose using each reference in a user interface description to access the associated information contained in a

corresponding device to generate, and then display, a user interface for that device. Lea mentions a standard device description structure called the self describing data (SDD) structure (col. 10, lines 1-2), however, Lea does not teach using a reference in a corresponding user interface description to access the associated information in each device. Further, Lea does not disclose that each device has an SDD that is contained in that device, wherein that SDD is then accessed using links in a user interface description that is generated in another device.

(g) As per claim 6, it is clear that in Lea's example, when a new device (e.g., camcorder) is connected to the network, a user interface for the new device cannot be displayed on the newly connected device itself. By contrast, Claim 6 herein requires the steps of "connecting a client device to the network capable of displaying a user interface", and the displaying a user interface on the client device. Indeed, in FIGS. 12A and 12B Lea shows a UI display on a TV screen for the newly connected camcorder device. Further, in the above passage, Lea does not disclose displaying a user interface on the client device "using the references in a user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network", as required by Claim 6.

(h) As per Claim 7, As per Claim 7, for reasons described above, Lea does not disclose "displaying a user interface, and further comprising the steps of: displaying a user interface on said at least one device using the references in the user interface description, for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network", as required by Claim 7.

(i) As per Claim 8, for reasons described above, Lea does not disclose "generating each user interface description such that the reference in that user interface description provides access to at least the information in each corresponding device", as required by Claim 8.

(j) As per Claim 9, for reasons described above, Lea does not disclose "generating each user interface description such that the user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device", as required by Claim 9.

(k) As per Claim 10, Lea does not disclose that "the device information in each device includes device identification information." In col. 7, lines 20-27, referenced by the Patent Office, Lea does not teach the limitations of Claim 10, and certainly there is no mention of device identification information as claimed herein.

(l) As per Claim 11, Lea does not disclose that "the device information in each device includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device" (emphasis added), as required by Claim 11.

(m) As per Claim 12, Lea does not disclose "generating each user interface description such that each reference in the user interface description is to at least the user control interface description in each corresponding device", as required by Claim 12.

(n) As per Claim 13, Lea does not disclose "generating the user interface description such that the user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device, the device data providing reference to the user control interface description in each device", as required by Claim 13. As discussed, there is no user interface description generated in Lea.

(o) As per independent Claim 14, the rejection of Claim 14 is respectfully traversed for the reasons given above in relation to Claim 1. Further, Applicant believe that Lea does not

Art Unit: 2174

disclose "an agent" in a device for obtaining information and generating a user interface description as required by Claim 14.

(p) As per claims 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26, the rejection of Claims 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 is respectfully traversed for the reasons given above in relation to Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Further, Lea does not disclose multiple agents as claimed.

(q) As per independent Claim 27, the rejection of Claim 27 is respectfully traversed for the reasons given above in relation to Claim 14. Further, Applicant believe that Lea does not disclose "an agent" in multiple devices for obtaining information and generating a user interface description as required by Claim 27.

(r) As per Claims 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 39, the rejection of Claims 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 39 is respectfully traversed for the reasons given above in relation to Claims 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26.

(s) As per Claims 3, Venkatraman, col. 3, lines 5-61 (relied upon by the Patent Office), does not disclose "generating a user interface description" nor does Venkatraman disclose generating such a user interface description by "associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network", as required by Claim 3. Indeed, in col. 3, lines 561, Venkatraman simply states that Web access functionality is embedded in a device 10 using web server software for execution by a processor 200. There is no teaching in Venkatraman of associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network.

(t) One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to combine Lea and Venkatraman. Nor is there a motivation or suggestion in either reference to do so. Even if Lea and Venkatraman are combined as suggested by the Patent Office, the result does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Further, such a combination would simply mean including a web server in each device of Lea. This provides no advantage for the purpose of Lea which is providing interoperability and integration of a plurality of devices in a network. Lea is simply not concerned with, nor is appropriate for, the Patent Office's proposed modification to allow Lea's devices to interface with Internet, from service providers, via HTTP protocol. At any rate, such a modified system does not teach the limitations of Claim 3. Indeed, such a modified system teaches away from the claimed invention herein.

(u) As per Claim 4, Venkatraman does not disclose that the information in each device comprises an HTML page contained in that device. Further, the web server software of Venkatraman does not provide HTML to other devices in a network.

(v) As per Claim 5, Venkatraman does not disclose displaying the user interface on a browser on a device connected to the network, capable of displaying a user interface, as required by Claim 5. In col. 5, lines 29-64, and figs. 1 A, 2, Venkatraman describes that a browser 40 outside a home-based network, displays a user interface of a device 10, which is different than required by Claim 5.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

(a) Lea does teach the steps of generating a user interface for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network, by obtaining information from one or more of the devices

currently connected to the network at col. 6, lines 58-67 through col. 7, line 1 (*An icon representing the appliance may then appear on the television screen*). Each icon is in fact a user interface description associated with a connected device based on the obtained information. Furthermore, Fig. 12A-12B; col. 25, lines 9-22 give an example of a user interface of a device (camcorder) connected to the network.

(b) Lea does teach a user interface description in col. 19, lines 39-67. In fact *“the DCM is also responsible for the UI aspects of the device. In the case of level 1 interoperability, a generic UI is used to interface with users. This may be augmented by basic SDD data that allows such aspects as UI icons to be specified and accessed by the generic DCM.”*

(c) The interface in fig. 12A-12B is in fact *“including a reference associated with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network”, “such that the reference includes at least one link to information contained in said devices currently connected to the network”*. By that Lea does teach the concept of using links in the user interface description, wherein the links provide access to information stored in devices connected to the network.

(d) The claimed language itself only stated that displaying one or more user interfaces each based on one of user interface descriptions, on one or more devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface. In fact, according to Lea, the user interfaces can be displayed on any device capable of displaying a user interface (col. 17, lines 18-27).

(f) According to Lea, standard device description structure called self describing data (SDD) is provided to allow other devices to access the device's user interface information (col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-2). It is inherent that references such as links to device

information must be provided to allow other devices to access to the device's SDD. Also according to Lea, the graphical representation within the SDD data structure is generated and displayed, on a device capable of displaying a user interface, to present a pictorial representation of the devices in the home network to users (col. 10, lines 5-19).

(g) Fig. 12A and 12B are just examples about the camcorder device (incapable of displaying a user interface) connected to the network. However, if another TV (capable of displaying a user interface) is connected to the network, a user interface is displayed on that TV for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network. In fact, according to Lea, the user interfaces can be displayed on any device capable of displaying a user interface (col. 17, lines 18-27). Also, According to Lea, standard device description structure called self describing data (SDD) is provided to allow other devices access to the device's user interface information (col. 9, lines 66-67 through col. 10, lines 1-2). It is inherent that references such as links to device information must be provided to allow other devices to access to the device's SDD. Also according to Lea, the graphical representation within the SDD data structure is generated and displayed, on a device capable of displaying a user interface, to present a pictorial representation of the devices in the home network to users (col. 10, lines 5-19).

(h), (i) and (j), the same argument of claim 2 is applied here.

(k) Lea in fact does teach the device information in each device includes device identification information by disclosing, *"When new devices join the home network, they are recognized and added to a global name database (registry). The registry holds information about their characteristics and provides a reference to a handler for that device."* in col. 9, lines 27-33.

(l) Lea indeed does disclose that "the device information in each device includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device" by stating that "*the graphical representation within the SDD data structure allows an FAV node to present a pictorial representation of the devices in the home network to users. By defining the graphical representation in a sufficiently generic manner, a device's SDD graphical data can be used in any vendor's product to display a user interface for that device.*" (Col. 10, lines 7-13)

(m) Lea does disclose "generating each user interface description such that each reference in the user interface description is to at least the user control interface description in each corresponding device" in col. 2, lines 57-67 through col. 3, lines 1-4, and col. 6, lines 40-48.

(n) As per Claim 13, Lea does not disclose "generating the user interface description such that the user interface description further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device, the device data providing reference to the user control interface description in each device" in col. 6, lines 58-67 through col. 7, lines 1-9.

(o) The same argument of claim 1 is applied here.

(p) The same arguments of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are applied here in rejections of claims 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26.

(q) The same argument of claim 1 is applied here.

(r) The same arguments of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are applied here in rejections of claims 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 and 39.

(s) As per claims 4 and 5, Venkatraman in fact does disclose "generating a user interface description" by stating "*Any of the devices 50-52 that implement the device web page mechanisms disclosed herein may provide device specific user interface web pages to the web*

Art Unit: 2174

browser 40 via the home-based network 30” in col. 5, lines 47-50. He also discloses generating such a user interface description by “associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network” in fig. 3; by clicking on the hyper-text links 66, 67, and 68, the users can access to the printer device information that currently connects to the network. By that Venkatraman indeed does teach associating a hyper-text link with the device information of each of said devices currently connected to the network.

(t) In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as per claims 4 and 5, one of ordinary skill in the art would indeed be motivated to look to combine Lea's home network control system and Venkatraman's web access mechanism in a home-based network system (fig. 2) because it would upgrade Lea's home network control system to the latest web/HTML graphical user interface and HTTP network technologies in order to make his system easier to adapt to the web/Internet network.

(u) As per Claim 5, Venkatraman indeed does disclose that the information in each device comprises an HTML page contained in that device (col.3, lines 30-31; *the web server 14 generates a web page 18 that defines a set of user interface functions for the device 10. The web page 18 is a Hypertext markup Language (HTML) file*).

(v) Browser 40 is in fact a device capable of displaying the user interface and it is connected to the home-based network 30 just like the device 10; therefore, it is inside a home-based network, not outside.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM with every other Friday off.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
June 2, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100